



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,331	06/15/2000	Robert J. Mattila	1894-174	8526

22471 7590 07/07/2003

PATENT LEGAL DEPARTMENT/A-42-C
BECKMAN COULTER, INC.
4300 N. HARBOR BOULEVARD
BOX 3100
FULLERTON, CA 92834-3100

EXAMINER

BEX, PATRICIA K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)	9
	09/594,331	MATTILA ET AL.	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	P. Kathryn Bex	1743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears in the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2003 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 7,8 and 16-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 9,10 and 12-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>19</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 1743

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 27, 2003 has been entered. The cancellation of claim 11 is acknowledged and has been entered into the record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15, line 15, recites the limitation "said spring-loaded members". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1743

5. Claims 9-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McCulloch *et al* (EP 351 988 A2).

McCulloch *et al* teach a transporting and storing system comprising: multiplicity of reagent packs 12; a gantry movable on a rack structure for carrying a gripper 21 having gripping jaws 20 for engagement with the reagent pack; a power assembly for actuating the gantry and gripping jaws. McCulloch *et al* teach a storage nest comprising a multiplicity of compartments 11 aligned in vertical columns and horizontal rows, each compartment adapted for storing a reagent pack. The uppermost horizontal row 10a of compartment is considered by the Examiner to constitute the pipetting nest and the uppermost horizontal row compartments constitute the means for maintaining the precise pipetting position of the reagent pack for simultaneous pipetting via pipetters 14 along this uppermost row. Additionally, McCulloch teach at least one transport route for allowing movement of the gripper mechanism between the storage nest and the pipetting nest (column 3, lines 23-31); means for positioning and retaining the reagent packs by the gripper mechanism, e.g. pack projections or grooves and complementary formations on the gripper (column 4, lines 50-55). Although the wells of the pack are dosed with antibodies not specifically a reagent, this is considered by the Examiner a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a *structural difference* between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is *capable of performing* the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCulloch *et al* (EP 351 988 A2).

McCulloch *et al* teach the means for positioning and retaining the reagent packs having projections or grooves and the gripper having complementary formations (column 4, lines 50-55). McCulloch *et al* does not recited the specific use of conical openings or conical pins. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the projections or grooves in a conical shape, since applicant has not disclosed that conical projections or grooves solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the projections or grooves of McCulloch *et al*.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See above Office Action.

Conclusion

10. Claims 9-10, 13-15 are rejected. Claims 1-6 allowable.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to P. Kathryn Bex whose telephone number is (703) 306-5697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays, alternate Fridays from 6:00 am to 3:30 pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 308-4037.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310 for official papers prior to mailing of a Final Office Action. For after-Final Office Actions use (703) 872-9311. For unofficial or draft papers use fax number (703) 305-7719. Please label all faxes as official or unofficial. The above fax numbers will allow the paper to be forwarded to the examiner in a timely manner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

P. Kathryn Bex

P. Kathryn Bex
Patent Examiner
AU 1743
July 2, 2003